

REMARKS

The above amendments are made in response to the Final Office action of November 16, 2007 and Advisory Action of March 3, 2008. This response is being submitted with a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 8-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-7 have been previously cancelled. Claims 8 and 11-13 stand rejected over prior art references.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner has indicated that the present application includes allowable subject matter. The Examiner states that claims 9, 10 and 14-16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 8 has been amended, leaving claims 8-16 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. Support for the amendment to claim 8 may be found at least in original claim 1 and page 5 of the specification, as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Barent, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim."

Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co., 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1274 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claims 8 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Hamano et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0001109, hereinafter "Hamano"). The Examiner states that Hamano discloses all of the elements of the

abovementioned claims, primarily in FIG. 18. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason set forth below.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*: a light diffraction layer formed directly on the inner surface or an outer surface of the insulating substrate and including a diffraction pattern . . . wherein the light is diffracted by and passes through the light diffraction layer. Thus amended claim 1 describes a light diffraction layer including a diffraction lattice, and the light is diffracted by and passes through the light diffraction layer.

In contrast, Hamano discloses a hologram forming layer including an embossed pattern and a reflection electrode with embossed pattern by the hologram forming layer, and forming hologram by the light random reflecting from the reflection electrode. In particular, Hamano discloses a computer-generated hologram H, herein referred to as (3), that may be disposed as a reflector between the liquid crystal layer 45 and a back substrate 42' in the reflective LCD, as shown in FIG. 18 relied upon by the Examiner. The reflective layer 51 of the computer-generated hologram H also serves as an optical reflective electrode 44'. [Paragraph 0185]. More specifically, FIG. 18 of Hamano discloses illumination light (52) incident on the LCD (40) and reflected by the optical reflective electrode 44' such that no light passes through optical reflective electrode 44' equated to the light diffraction layer 44' by the Examiner. That is, the hologram forming layer of Hamano does not correspond to the light diffraction layer of the present invention. Accordingly, Hamano does not disclose all features of claim 1.

In particular, Hamano does not teach or suggest wherein the light is diffracted by and passes through the light diffraction layer, as recited in amended independent claim 8.

Thus, independent claim 8, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 9-13, 15 and 16, admittedly define over Hamano.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejections and allow claims 8 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, the present application including claims 8-13, 15 and 16 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections. If there are any charges due with respect to this response, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Cantor Colburn LLP
20 Church St., 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: March 17, 2008